

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,981	03/03/2000	Julie A. Bearcroft	P01952US0	5566
75	590 04/24/2003			
JOEL R. PETROW, ESQ.			EXAMINER	
CHIEF PATEN SMITH & NEP			PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E	
1450 BROOKS	ROAD			
MEMPHIS, TN	38116		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3738	10
			DATE MAILED: 04/24/2003	19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

110			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1.1
Advisory Action	09/517,981	BEARCROFT ET AL.	<u> </u>
7. , 7	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian E Pellegrino	3738	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 16 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply the places the application in the places the application in the properties	to a on in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the appropount of the fee. The approportion of the fee.	n. In the second of the second
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	•	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simp	olifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed ar	nendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>See</u>		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were r	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examine	er.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	(.')		
	CORRINE McDERMOTT		
	SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAM TECHNOLOGY CENTER 370	iner 20	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1) the Final was proper because new claims were submitted with new limitations i.e. "the particle has bilateral symmetry," "the axes of any two adjacent arms are at right angles from one another," "the extremeties are of the same shape and size," "the angles between any adjacent extremeties in the particle are approximately equal" all requiring new consideration and a search, thus necessitating the new grounds of rejection. Additionally, amendments to the claims were made with the new limitation "no more than six" requiring new consideration. According to MPEP 706.07, when applying a reference it should be fully applied, not just to some claims because another reference did not read on those it applied to. 2) the claims are anticipated and obvious over the prior art of record as presented in the Office action and the remarks are not persuasive. 3) the declaration was considered in the last Office action and was briefly noted, but was moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.